

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT 41

HON. RAYMOND CARDENAS, JUDGE

RELIGIOUS TECHNOLOGY CENTER, A )  
CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT RELIGIOUS )  
CORPORATION; CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY )  
INTERNATIONAL, A CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT )  
RELIGIOUS CORPORATION; AND CHURCH OF )  
SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA, A )  
CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT RELIGIOUS )  
CORPORATION, )

PLAINTIFFS, )

VS. )

JOSEPH A. YANNY, AN INDIVIDUAL; )  
JOSEPH A. YANNY, A PROFESSIONAL LAW )  
CORPORATION; AND DOES 1 THROUGH 25, )  
INCLUSIVE, )

DEFENDANTS. )

SUPERIOR COURT  
CASE NO. BC 033035

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

AUGUST 6, 1991

APPEARANCES:

(AS NOTED ON NEXT PAGE.)

COPY

LINDA STALEY, CSR NO. 3359  
OFFICIAL REPORTER

EXHIBIT E

1 CETERA, NOTHING TO DO WITH ADVERSE REPRESENTATION OF  
2 SCIENTOLOGY. THEY DO NOT HAVE THE RIGHT --

3 THE COURT: MR. YANNY, I STATED THAT THE TRO WAS TOO  
4 BROAD IN THAT IT IS THE COURT'S INTENT NOT TO PRECLUDE  
5 ASSOCIATION, DISCUSSION, AND SO FORTH, AND I THOUGHT THAT  
6 WOULD SEND THE MESSAGE THAT IF THERE WAS AN ORDER, IT WOULD  
7 BE A LOT MORE NARROW THAN THE TRO THAT WAS SIGNED.

8 MR. YANNY: YOUR HONOR, BUT BASED ON THE STRENGTH OF  
9 WHAT THEY'VE SHOWN; NOTHING?

10 AND WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO DO BY GIVING THESE,  
11 THE MOST LITIGIOUS PEOPLE IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, MAYBE  
12 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND MAYBE THE UNITED STATES,  
13 YOU'RE GOING TO GIVE THEM AN ORDER BY WHICH THEY ARE THEN  
14 GOING TO HARASS EVERY ONE OF MY EMPLOYEES LIKE YOU SAW THEM  
15 DO BEFORE, EVERY ONE OF MY CLIENTS, LIKE YOU SAW THEM DO  
16 BEFORE.

17 OKAY. AND THAT, BASED ON THE STRENGTH OF  
18 WHAT THEY SHOWED, YOU KNOW, IT IS -- I HATE TO SAY THIS --  
19 THAT IS INEQUITABLE -- THAT IS INEQUITABLE -- AND ALL OF  
20 THIS BECAUSE I DID ONE THING; I HIRED GERRY ARMSTRONG AS A  
21 PARALEGAL TO HELP ME ON THE AZNARAN CASE?

22 THE COURT: NO. ALL BECAUSE --

23 MR. YANNY: I TOLD HIM ABOUT COPYRIGHT NOTICES AND I  
24 MADE AN APPEARANCE IN A FEDERAL CASE AND THAT THE JUDGE  
25 DISQUALIFIED ME.

26 I DON'T THINK AN ORDER IS APPROPRIATE. THIS  
27 CASE SHOULD HAVE BEEN THROWN OUT WHEN YOU SAW THE  
28 COMPLAINT.